

### **REMARKS**

The Examiner's comments from the Office Action mailed October 9, 2008 have been carefully considered. Claims 1-20 remain pending in the application. No claims have been amended and no new matter has been added.

Applicants respectfully request reexamination and allowance of the pending claims.

#### **Allowed Claims**

Applicants thank the Examiner for allowing claims 1-12.

#### **Claim Rejections**

Claims 13-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Publication No. 2002/0181922 to Xin et al. (hereinafter "Xin"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 13 recites, in part, a mounting panel configured to pivot from a first position covering a cassette mount storage area to a second position providing access to the storage area.

Xin does not disclose or suggest a mounting panel configured to pivot from a first position covering a storage area of a cassette mount to a second position providing access to the storage area. Xin does not even disclose a panel pivotally mounted to cassette mount. The guard 103 of Xin is not a mounting panel configured to pivot from a first position to a second position as recited in claim 13. Paragraph [0024] describes the movement of the guard 103 as dropping down vertically and sliding backwards. There is no mention of guard 103 being pivotally mounted.

The Office Action asserts that paragraph [0019] of Xin provides support for the guard 103 to pivot instead of dropping and sliding. Applicants respectfully disagree. Paragraph [0019] of Xin indicates the term "tray" or "tray framework" is intended to include *trays* that slide, pivot, or both. The tray framework 101 shown in Xin is equipped with slide rails 102 to allow the tray to be slid into and out of an internal cavity of a cabinet structure. See paragraph [0022] of Xin. Paragraph [0019] of Xin clarifies that the tray framework 101 of Xin could be configured to pivot into and out of the internal cavity of the cabinet structure instead of sliding on slide rails 102.

Reply to Office Action of October 9, 2008

The guard 103 is not a tray as recited in paragraph [0019]. The Office Action points out that the guard 103 is part of the tray framework 101. However, paragraph [0019] does not disclose that *portions* of the tray framework can slide and/or pivot relative to each other. Rather, paragraph [0019] indicates that the tray framework as a whole can be configured to slide and/or pivot. No reason is provided in Xin or elsewhere to modify the tray framework 101 to enable portions of the tray framework 101 to pivot with respect to other portions of the framework 101.

For at least these reasons, Xin would not lead a person skilled in the art to the invention of claim 13. Claims 14-20 depend from claim 13 and are allowable for at least the same reasons. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 13-20 are respectfully requested. Applicants do not otherwise concede the correctness of the rejection and reserve the right to make additional arguments if necessary.

#### **Conclusion**

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request a Notice of Allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P. C  
P. O. Box 2903  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903  
(612) 332-5300

Date: Jan. 9, 2009

By Steven C. Bruess

Steven C. Bruess  
Reg. No. 34,130  
SCB/JKS:rlk

**23552**

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE